



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

### III.—VINDICIAE PHAEDRIANAE.

The fabulist Phaedrus, as I have said elsewhere, was unhappy in his life and ill fortune pursued him after death. And in our days his remains and his reputation have suffered not a little from the undiscerning impatience of a generation alternately, as precipitate in acceptance of a mechanical principle as irrational in revolt against it. The hope that I can undo something of what has been done amiss in current exposition and criticism is expressed in the title to this paper. My task is the exigent scrutiny of details; it offers no room for the collecting industry which amasses its hoard without a suspicion that every coin in it may be base. It will involve consideration of the fabulist's idiosyncrasies, repellent, as it would seem, to more than one of his critics, and of the condition of his text which has been perhaps as much oppressed by the comments and corrections of the scholar as impaired by the corruptions of the scribe.

In the Fables, as now presented to us, there is much to cause offence; many things, one is forced to think, that have been miswritten, miscopied or misunderstood. Hence a triple divergence in the ways of critics, some blaming the author, some altering the words and some contorting their sense. I will begin with instances where he has been reprehended for inconsistency, inconcinnity or falsity to fact.

No. XIV of the Appendix of Cardinal Perotti has been the object of more than one attack and the first two lines have not escaped. The crisp conciseness of the couplet

Vnam expetebant uirginem iuuenes duo  
uicit locuples genus et formam pauperis

might have disarmed suspicion. But because it is not expressly declared that the rich suitor was low-born and ill-favoured and because the poor suitor's avocation as a market gardener (*hortulanus*) has to be understood from his *hortuli* in v. 5 and his *asellus* in vv. 11 f., the *brevitas* of Phaedrus (II prol. 12, IV epil. 7, III 10. 60 '*brevitate nimia quoniam quosdam offendi-*

*mus'*) is forgotten and a lacuna of from one to four lines invented.

Through similar inattention the topographical indications have been blamed as obscure. The rich suitor had a house in the town (v. 8); and from this the marriage procession starts (9, 10) for his larger country mansion where the festivities were to be held. This mansion was on the same road as the poor suitor's cottage and market garden (which were at no great distance from the town, *propinquos—hortulos* 5), only a little further on (*ultra paulo* 6). The route of the procession lay through the city gate. Here (a very natural station) the poor suitor's ass was standing, and it was commandeered for the lady's use (11-14). A sudden storm came on; and the ass with his burden made for the nearest refuge, the cottage that he knew so well (21). What obscurity is there here? Has the critic stumbled over the application of *portae in limine* to a city gate? If he has not read the second Aeneid (242 *ipso in limine portae*), his author had (III prol. 27 f.).

At I 4. 2 Phaedrus has been censured for making a swimming dog see his reflection in the water. But the swimming animal is not the fabulist's but his editors'. The lines should be punctuated

Canis per flumen carnem dum ferret, natans  
lympbarum in speculo uidit simulacrum suum.

For *natans* of the swimming image see Statius Theb. 2. 42 'ingens medio *natat umbra* profundo'. The illustrator of the Fables of the Ademar Paraphrast (no. vii) did not make the mistake. See the reproduction in Thiele's edition, Der illustrierte Aesop in der Handschrift des Ademar, plate II and pages 25, 42 of the letterpress. None of the other Paraphrasts make the dog swim, but, as it would seem, cross by a bridge.

In the Fable of the Panther and the Countrymen, III 2, we read in our current texts that, when the beast was caught in the pit,

alii fustes congerunt,  
alii onerant saxis; quidam contra miseriti,  
periturae quippe *quamuis nemo laederet*,      5  
misere panem ut sustineret spiritum.

The Latinity of this, the reading of the Pithoeanus and the lost Remensis, if, as seems unavoidable, it has to be understood,

not in the sense of *quamquam nemo laedebat* (-eret) but in that of *etiamsi nemo laesurus esset*, is more than questionable; this however is not my present concern. But what a reason for compassion! 'Some pitied the beast because it would die—in any case'! And yet we have two clues to the true and the simple sense; first, that of the author in the last line of the fable where the Panther says 'I return to punish those who have *injured me*' ('*qui me laeserunt*'), and, secondly, the evidence of the 'Paraphrasts'<sup>1</sup> who agree in a clear testimony to something very unlike what P and R present '*parcite innocenti quae neminem laesit*'. This has been noted by L. Mueller, who proposed '*cum laesisset neminem*,' and by Riese, whose remedy was '*neminem quae laeserit*'. The fatal objection to both is that they pay no regard to P R whose reading should not merely be rejected but accounted for. The indirect witness has given us the sense, and the direct must help us to the words. Of the three words that compose the phrase, two, *quamvis* and *laederet*, are in themselves unexceptionable. The offending *nemo* is left. If it goes, as it must, there are only two words that can be put in its place, *nullum* and *nullos*, both equally near to the easy corruption *nullus*, for which *nemo* is simply a substitute.

Just exception is taken to anything which, like the *nemo* in the passage last considered, injures the purpose of the story. This does not apply to the carnivorous cow and her companions in I 5, animals that, if they could, would have been as summarily removed as was the vegetarian fox of Horace, Ep. I 7. 29, by Bentley. Critics, as I have observed elsewhere<sup>2</sup>, are prone to confuse these creatures of Fable with their congeners in common life. If we do not trouble about their talking, why should we be particular about their eating? They are not beings but types of character, as indeed Phaedrus himself indicates here '*patiens ouis iniuriae*' v. 3. Had Phaedrus thought it was necessary to apologize for providing his domestic beasts with the appetites which would make them hunt with a lion, his answer to an objector would no doubt have been '*fictis meminerit nos iocari fabulis*' I prol. 7.

<sup>1</sup> On the importance of the indications in these mediaeval collections to the student of the text of Phaedrus I may refer to my recent articles in *Classical Philology*, XIII 262 sqq. and the *Classical Quarterly*, XII 89 sqq.

<sup>2</sup> *Classical Quarterly*, VIII (1914), 240 f.

The trouble is different at I 2. 16 where both fact and expression have been imperfectly understood. The Frogs pray to Jupiter for a King; and in response a small log is dropped from heaven. Its fall and splash upon the marsh put the timid inhabitants in a fright:

paruum tigillum missum quod subito uadi  
motu sonoque terruit pavidum genus. 15

Phaedrus proceeds:

hoc mersum limo cum iaceret diutius,  
forte una tacite profert e stagno caput  
et explorato rege cunctas euocat.  
illae timore posito certatim adnatant  
lignumque supra turba petulans insilit. 20

So unnatural is it to refer *hoc—iaceret* (for which *lateret* has indeed been conjectured) to the *pavidum genus* instead of the *paruum tigillum* that those who do so cannot have grasped the situation or the meaning of *mersum*. Carried by the momentum of its fall from the sky the log has plunged into the mud below the shallow pools. There it 'lies'; but it is not 'buried' therein. Its upper parts show above the surface, in view of the frog that first thrusts its head above the water and exposed to the invasion and insults of it and its companions. That 'plunging' is a legitimate rendering of *mergere* may be seen e. g. from Ovid Met. 3. 249 '*mersisque in corpore rostris*' of the dogs that thrust their fangs into Actaeon.

In III 7 a slur upon the poet's character as a stylist has been removed by M. Havet who, on the evidence furnished by the Paraphrasts (cf. Thiele, *Der lateinische Äsop des Romulus*, No. LXV), has transferred lines 21–24, a meaningless interruption where they are found in the MSS, to their proper position after 10. It is true that Thiele, *ib.*, p. xxxix, refuses to accept the transposition: "Die beiden Anstösse sind im Phädrus nicht etwa durch Umstellung zu tilgen, sondern da man weiss, dass er ungelenkt erzählt, zu belassen"; but Thiele's prejudice against the author, apparent in every part of his work, leads him to acquiesce in any blemish of the text.

About IV 13. 7, where however the text has not to my knowledge hitherto been suspected, I do not feel altogether sure. The Lion who has now 'made himself King over the Beasts'

and is ambitious to be thought a clement ruler abandons his previous habits.

atque inter illas *tenui* contentus *cibo*  
sancta incorrupta iura reddebat fide.

The change in the Lion's diet is ill expressed by '*tenui cibo*'. For what is meant is that he had been a flesh-eater, not that he had been a glutton or gourmet<sup>1</sup>. This was understood by the Weissenburg Paraphrast: '*contentus sine sanguine cibum*' i. e. '*cibo*.' Similarly other paraphrases "renuntians prioribus factis et mutauit consuetudinem '*pecus ullum se non laedere, sine sanguine cibum sumere*'" "*nec uoluit sanguineam praedam sequi*" (Thiele, No. LXX, pp. 236 f.). It is clear also from the sequel of the fable, which has been lost in Phaedrus but can be gathered from the versions of the Paraphrasts (Thiele l. c., Hervieux II, pp. 149, 188, 223), where the Ape falls a victim when the Lion relapses into his old carnivorous habits. A more suitable epithet is that used by Ovid, Met. 15. 478, where in contradistinction to animal food a vegetarian diet is called '*alimenta mitia*', that is, 'gentle' or 'humane'. Phaedrus then may well have written *miti* here. But I feel no assurance that he did.

In the whole of Phaedrus there is perhaps no more genuine product of Fable-land than the judgment of the Ape in the case of the Wolf and the Fox I 10

uterque causam cum perorassent suam,  
dixisse fertur simius sententiam  
'tu non uideris perdidisse quod petis;  
te credo surripuisse quod pulcre negas'.

'Liars both! Plaintiff nonsuited and defendant condemned!' Thus the Gilbertian judge; and no doubt there was 'applause and laughter in court'. But this jester's variation on 'not proven' has been too much for some critics of Phaedrus who desiderate a more serious treatment of logic and law, such as might have been expected from the Ape as he was conceived by Romulus the Paraphrast, IV 10, Thiele, Der lateinische Aesop,

<sup>1</sup> Cic. Tusc. Disp. III 49 '*Epicurus . . . tenuem uictum antefert copioso*' a passage cited by Thiele, op. cit., p. 239, who notes the discrepancy between the text of Phaedrus and the tradition of the Paraphrasts.

No. XLVIII, p. 146 'nudant fraudes suas et uera sibi dicunt mutuo crimina. tunc *iustus et uerax iudex indicauit inter partes eorum et de libello sententiam legit*. tu, inquit, quaeris quod non perdidisti et te tamen credo *aliquid surripuisse* quod bene negas in iudicio. talis sit abolitio uestra et pares exite concordēs'. That there was a strong vein of humour in the composition of Phaedrus we are justified in concluding from the apologies of the *mulier parturiens* I 18 and the *caluus et musca* V 3 with others besides.

Of the popular and easy-going modes of thinking congenial to the Fable we find examples elsewhere. In IV 22. 27 where Simonides is drawing a moral from the destitute condition of his fellow-passengers

'dixi' inquit 'mea  
mecum esse cuncta; uos quod *rapuistis* perit'.

I should myself have preferred Bentley's *habuistis* as providing a better contrast to *mea*. But I do not doubt that in *rapuistis* Simonides is glancing at the hasty gathering of their treasures by the passengers when the vessel sank (II).

Conversely in V 4. 9

sed dices 'qui rapuere diuitias *habent*'.  
numeremus agendum qui deprensi perierunt;  
maiores turbam punitorum reperies,  
paucis temeritas est bono, multis malo

it has been proposed to expel *habent* in favour of *latent*<sup>1</sup> or some less plausible substitute, the reason being that *habent* does not furnish a proper antithesis to *deprensi perierunt*. This is mere caprice. Verb and tense express that those who have clutched at riches 'still keep' their ill-gotten gains. So much is stated, and the rest is implied.

Two passages of V 5, the Ventriloquist and the Rustic, have been reprehended on grounds that I must think inadequate. In II, 12 we read

dispersus rumor ciuitatem concitat  
paulo ante *uacua* turbam deficiunt *loca*

which means that in the theatre that a while ago had been empty there was now no room for the crowd. The sense of *loca*

<sup>1</sup> Bentley altered *rapuere* to *latuere*.

with the adjective and with the verb is not absolutely the same ; but the slight shift of meaning is very natural and would certainly not have been noticed by a Roman.

In 29 ff.

tunc simulans sese uestimentis rusticus  
porcellum obtegere (quod faciebat scilicet  
sed in priore quia nil compererat latens)  
peruellit aurem uero quem celauerat

*simulans* has been censured because the pig was really there and so there was no 'pretence'. This is running language very hard. Why should not the participle mean 'trying', that is *affecting*, 'to pretend'?

At IV 19. 6

hanc alia cum rogaret causam facinoris  
respondit 'Ne quis discat prodesse improbis'

the real meaning of this impudently cynical defence of ingratitude appears to be 'That *all* should learn *not* to help the wicked'. Its illogical form belongs to popular and colloquial speech, which is apt to get confused where negatives are involved. *discat* has thus crept into the place of *uelit* or the like; and we have a mixture belonging to the same class as Livy's phrase 3. 41. 9 '*minus* in bono *constans* quam nauum in malitia ingenium' for which '*magis* in bono *non constans*' would have been expected.

One of the forms which the curtness of Phaedrus takes is the use of a word without the expected qualifier, a feature which we often find in Silver Latin writers. A simple example is II 8. 21 '*quia corruptos* uiderat nuper boues' which the Paraphrasts who give *macilentos* rightly understand as '*macie corruptos*' (the phrase of Caesar B. C. 3. 58. 5). The employment of *genus* for 'class of composition', 'branch of letters' in II 1. 1 '*Exemplis continetur Aesopi genus*' has provoked a number of emendations though it only carries the use of IV prol. 13 '*usus uetusto genere* sed rebus nouis' a short step further.

It is an interesting question whether curtness or inconsistency is to be seen in App. 15. 10 where Aesop affords a warning on



the danger of speaking the truth. His mistress is enraged at his plainspeaking on the subject of her charms

et *obiurgari* iussit *seruum* garrulum,

a castigation to which Aesop refers at the end of the piece

‘*flagris* sum *caesus*, uerum quia dixi modo’.

Now it is true that elsewhere *obiurgare*, when used of physical correction, takes an ablative of the instrument and hence *seruum* is usually amended to *ferula* or *ferulis*. If however the qualifier may be suppressed, *seruum* may be retained with a very good sense “ordered him to be ‘rebuked’ as a talkative slave”, that is, for forgetting his position. Both *ferulis* (Suetonius Cal. 20) and *flagris* (id. Otho 2) are found with *obiurgari*; but they did not mean the same, as ‘the freedman of Augustus’ would be well aware. If then the slave who had been admonished with a cane said he had been cut with a lash, this must be regarded as intentional exaggeration.

Misconception of the uses of *uirgo* has caused trouble in the Ephesian tale of the Widow and the Soldier, App. 13. In 5 for

claram assecuta est famam *castae uirginis*

M. Havet’s text gives *casto uiduuo*. Mr. L. Rank, *Mnemosyne* 40. 53, proposes *casta uiduitas*. But *uirgo* often means no more than a ‘young woman’, whether married or single. In Verg. Buc. 6. 46, 52 ‘infelix uirgo’ is addressed to the wife of Minos and the mother of the Minotaur and Silius’s application of it to Pyrene in 3. 420 ff. may serve to show that there was nothing peculiar in the use: ‘nomen Bebrycia duxere a *uirgine* colles, | hospitibus Alcidae crimen qui . . . | lugendam formae *sine uirginitate* reliquit | Pyrenen’ and after this ‘laceris Tirynthius artus, | dum remeat uictor, lacrimis perfudit et amens | palluit inuento dilectae *uirginis* ore’. So far from touching *uirgo* in v. 5 we should do well to restore it to Phaedrus in v. 28.

at sancta *mulier* ‘non est quod timeas’ ait  
uirique corpus tradit figendum cruci

following at once upon

turbatus miles factum exponit *mulieri*

has very properly been questioned. 'sancta *uidua*', the received correction, gives a collocation of words that Phaedrus might certainly have used though there is nothing to show that he would. 'sancta *uirgo*' is however a preferable substitute. It would carry a sting in its double entente that would be at once appropriate to the situation and characteristic of the author, the 'improbi Phaedri' of Martial. Compare the song that the mad Ophelia sings: 'Let in the *maid* that out a *maid* | Never departed more'. It was however an expression that our Cardinal-editor would for a very obvious reason remove as profane.<sup>1</sup>

Sometimes the offence is that the word employed is not as apt as we could wish; but in a language so poor in synonyms as Latin this should not count for so very much. In III 8. 14 sqq.

'Cotidie' inquit 'speculo uos uti uolo,  
tu formam ne corrumpas nequitiae malis,  
tu faciem ut istam moribus uincas bonis',

both *malis* and *uincas* have been challenged and more expressive words sought for. *malis*, for which Scheffer would actually substitute *mac(u)lis*, is defended by the metre and the correspondence of *bonis*. For *uincas* Bentley proposed *penses* and Triller *pingas*, accepted by M. Havet. But *uincas* is not more than legitimately vague and 'to defeat your (unlovely) face' may well be understood of nullifying or neutralizing its unloveliness. Elsewhere in Latin poets we find *uincere* used where we expect a more distinctive word, as in Tibullus I 8. 55 'poterat custodia *uinci*' where *decipi* is meant and Propertius IV 6. 68 'una decem *uicit* missa sagitta rates' ('put out of action', we might say).

*pati* is used in a similar way and would certainly have been attacked in III epil. 26 'decerne quod religio, quod *patitur* fides | et gratulari me fac iudicio tuo' if any convenient verb with a more positive signification could have been found. But here again Phaedrus does not stand alone. Compare Lucan 4. 352

<sup>1</sup> What he would take upon himself to do in the interests of religious decorum may be seen from III 10. 39, where 'a *diuo* Augusto tunc petiere iudices' is transformed into 'pontificem maximum rogarunt'.

'tradimus Hesperias gentes, aperimus Eoas | securumque orbis *patimur* post terga relictī', 9. 365 'abstulit arboribus pretium nemorique laborem | Alcides *passusque* inopes sine pondere ramos | rettulit Argolico fulgentia poma tyranno'. To say a man 'permits' a direct effect of his own action, strikes us not unnaturally as odd.

*cogere* in V 5. 34 sq.

adclamat populus scurram multo similis  
imitatum et *cogit* rusticum trudi foras

does not mean 'force' but 'would force', 'insists'. It is obvious that the rustic was not ejected after the dénouement. The passage should have been cited in the Thesaurus s. u. in connection with Propertius I 4. 2 and III 11. 42.

J. P. POSTGATE.

UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL, May 16, 1918.